

This is the accepted manuscript made available via CHORUS. The article has been published as:

$$\text{P-T-Symmetry-Enabled Spin Circular Photogalvanic Effect in Antiferromagnetic Insulators}$$

Ruixiang Fei, Wenshen Song, Lauren Pusey-Nazzaro, and Li Yang

Phys. Rev. Lett. **127**, 207402 — Published 12 November 2021

DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.127.207402](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.127.207402)

PT-symmetry enabled spin circular photogalvanic effect in antiferromagnetic insulators

Ruixiang Fei,^{1,†} Wenshen Song,¹ Lauren Pusey-Nazzaro,¹ Li Yang^{1, 2, ‡}

¹ *Department of Physics, Washington University in St Louis, St Louis, Missouri 63130, United States*

² *Institute of Materials Science and Engineering, Washington University in St. Louis, St. Louis, Missouri 63130, United States*

Abstract

The short timescale spin dynamics in antiferromagnets is an attractive feature from the standpoint of ultrafast spintronics. Yet generating highly polarized spin-current at room temperature remains a fundamental challenge for antiferromagnets. We propose a spin circular photogalvanic effect (spin-CPGE), in which circularly polarized light can produce a highly spin-polarized current at room temperature, through an “injection-current-like” mechanism in parity-time (*PT*) -symmetric antiferromagnetic (AFM) insulators. We demonstrate this effect by first-principles simulations of bilayer CrI₃ and room-temperature AFM hematite. The spin-CPGE is significant, and the magnitude of spin photocurrent is comparable with the widely observed charge photocurrent in ferroelectric materials. Interestingly, this spin photocurrent is not sensitive to spin-orbit interactions, which were regarded as fundamental mechanisms for generating spin-current. Given the fast response of light-matter interactions, large energy scale, and insensitivity to spin-orbit interactions, our work gives hope to realizing fast-dynamic and temperature-robust pure spin-current in a wide range of *PT*-symmetric AFM materials, including topological axion insulators and weak-relativistic magnetic insulators.

Introduction: Spintronics based on antiferromagnetic (AFM) materials has great potential in reducing device scale and power consumption [1–3]. In contrast to ferromagnets, AFMs are robust against perturbed magnetic fields, produce no stray fields, and are capable of generating large magneto-transport effects [1], making them promising for next-generation spintronics. Particularly, AFMs exhibit unique advantages in generating spin-current, which is the basis for spintronic devices. Compared with gigahertz microwave pulses used in ferromagnets, terahertz pulses can pump spin-current by exciting the left- and right-hand modes of magnons in AFMs [4–6] due to strong exchange interactions, giving rise to ultrafast spin dynamics [7]. Additionally, spin caloritronics based on magnons in AFMs, such as spin Seebeck and spin Nernst effects [8–11], was proposed to generate pure spin-current in the same device. However, because of the intrinsically small energy scales, magnon-based spin-current decay rapidly with increasing temperature [5,12], making it difficult for room-temperature device applications.

Optical pump-induced spin dynamics may be a promising approach to surmounting such difficulties because of its intrinsically larger energy scale [13,14] and observed strong light-matter interactions in magnetic materials [15–17]. Notably, second-order light-matter interactions, such as the circular photogalvanic effect (CPGE) or bulk photovoltaic effect (BPVE), are known to create charge current in polar materials at room temperature without bias [18–23]. Recently, this idea has been extended to two-dimensional (2D) parity-time (*PT*) symmetric AFM insulators [24] and topological axion insulators [25,26], in which a sizeable DC charge-current was predicted to be generated by linearly polarized light [24,25,27].

Beyond charge current, light can also drive spin-current [28–35]. For example, spin photocurrent was predicted in AFM hematite [31] and bilayer CrCl_3 [36] via the shift-current mechanism under linearly polarized light, denoted as the spin-BPVE [31]. Unfortunately, linearly-

polarized light simultaneously excites significant charge current because of the broken SU(2) symmetry due to spin-orbit coupling (SOC) [24,25], substantially diluting spin polarization of the overall current. Consequently, it remains a fundamental challenge to generate highly polarized spin-current in AFMs at room temperature.

In this work, we predict a spin circular photogalvanic effect (spin-CPGE), in which circularly polarized light can generate pure spin-current in PT -symmetric antiferromagnets. This effect arises from a second-order light-matter interaction. *i.e.*, an inject-current-like mechanism. We demonstrate this prediction by first-principles simulations of two typical PT -symmetric antiferromagnets: low-temperature-AFM bilayer CrI_3 and room-temperature-AFM three-dimensional (3D) hematite. Because of PT -symmetry and circular polarization, charge-current is induced by the shift-current mechanism while pure spin-current is induced by the inject-current-like mechanism. Importantly, the magnitude of spin-current is about one to two orders larger than that of charge current, resulting in highly spin-polarized photocurrent. Moreover, we unexpectedly find that SOC is nonessential for generating a spin photocurrent. Our work suggests that collinear PT -symmetric AFMs, even weak-relativistic examples, can serve as effective and temperature-robust spin generators via ultrafast light-matter interactions.

PT -symmetry induced chiral spin photocurrent

Let us consider an AFM insulator that breaks both time-reversal symmetry (T) and parity symmetry (P) but respects PT . The Hamiltonian satisfies $H(k, \uparrow) = H(k, \downarrow)$ for any k wavevector, resulting in exactly double spin-degenerate bands, as shown in Figure 1(a). Because of these degenerate bands and zero Abelian Berry curvature, a bias field cannot effectively drive the longitudinal or transverse spin-current in PT -symmetric AFM insulators. Nevertheless, after

involving second-order light-electron interactions for the non-biased case, these degenerate spins exhibit different behaviors, enabling a spin-polarized photocurrent.

For a coherent light illumination, the general form of a second-order DC photocurrent is $J_c = \chi_{abc}(0; \omega, -\omega)E_a(\omega)E_b(-\omega)$, where $\chi_{abc}(0; \omega, -\omega)$ is the DC photoconductivity. For light circularly polarized in the ab -plane, the inject-current-like spin photoconductivity $\eta_{abc}^{\uparrow, \alpha} \equiv \chi_{abc}(0; \omega, -\omega)$ under the relaxation-time approximation is [19,37]

$$\eta_{abc}^{\uparrow, \alpha} = \frac{-\pi e^3}{\hbar^2 \omega^2} \sum_{mn} \int d^3k \operatorname{Im}(v_{mn, \alpha}^a(k) v_{nm, \alpha}^b(k)) f_{mn} (\langle m | \{\sigma_\alpha, v_c\} | m \rangle \tau_m - \langle n | \{\sigma_\alpha, v_c\} | n \rangle \tau_n) \delta(\omega - \omega_{mn}), \quad (1)$$

where $\operatorname{Im}(v_{mn, \alpha}^a(k) v_{nm, \alpha}^b(k)) = \frac{1}{2} (v_{mn, \alpha}^a v_{nm, \alpha}^b(k) - v_{nm, \alpha}^b(k) v_{mn, \alpha}^a(k))$ is the imaginary part of optical oscillator strength. $v_{mn, \alpha}^a(k)$ and $v_{nm, \alpha}^b(k)$ are the a -direction and b -direction interband velocity matrix elements between the m -th and n -th bands with α spin, respectively. $f_{mn} = f(\epsilon_{mk}) - f(\epsilon_{nk})$ is the occupation number difference. τ_m is the minimum value of spin-relaxation and free-carrier relaxation times of the m -th band carrier. $\{\sigma_\alpha, v_c\} = \frac{1}{2} (v_c \sigma_\alpha + \sigma_\alpha v_c)$ and $\langle m | \{\sigma_\alpha, v_c\} | m \rangle$ is the c -direction velocity matrix of the m -th band carrier with α -direction spin. The optical selection rules of circularly polarized light should be satisfied by the orbital angular momentum of involved electronic states. It is worth noting that spin-current may not be well defined for systems with strong SOC. However, Shi *et. al.* proved that the traditional definition of spin-current remains a good approximation if the spin-relaxation time is long or SOC is weak [38]; our following predictions are for materials fitting these criteria.

From PT -symmetry, electronic bands are spin degenerate, and the group velocity matrix of two spins should be in the same direction, namely, the spin velocity matrices satisfy $\{\sigma_\uparrow, v_c\} = \{\sigma_\downarrow, v_c\}$. However, the PT -symmetry enforces a constraint: $\operatorname{Im}(v_{mn, \uparrow}^a(k) v_{nm, \uparrow}^b(k)) =$

$-Im(v_{mn,\downarrow}^a(k)v_{nm,\downarrow}^b(k))$. Therefore, the spin-“up” photoconductivity of Eq. 1 is opposite to the spin-“down” photoconductivity. Since the overall spin photoconductivity is defined as $\eta^s = \eta(\uparrow) - \eta(\downarrow)$, we expect a pure spin-current contribution. Finally, the overall spin-current is obtained by an integral over the whole reciprocal space. As shown in Figure 1(b), if the energy contour of light-pumped free carriers is not symmetric, which is the typical case in non-centrosymmetric materials, the integral spin-current is nonzero. Intuitively, the light-driven electron transportations are helical channels where the electron spin projection is connected with its transport direction: the spin-“up” electrons are traveling in one direction, while the spin-“down” electrons are moving in the opposite direction, generating a pure spin-current shown in Figure 1 (c).

Light will create electrons and holes simultaneously, and the total spin-current is comprised of the hole and electron contributions in Eq. 1. Figures 1(d) and 1(e) illustrate the roles of electrons and holes and how to measure spin-current. We define the light-generated spin-“down” electron and spin-“down” hole pair (or spin-“up” electron and spin-“up” hole pair) as shown in Figure 1(d). Under circularly polarized light, the excited holes and electrons with the same spin direction should travel in opposite directions. In Figure 1 (e), the spin-“up” electrons and spin-“down” holes are accumulated at the left boundary of the AFM insulator. If attached to a FM material, in which the majority is assumed to be spin-“up”, the spin-“down” holes will annihilate with the minority spin-“down” electrons in the FM material while the spin-“up” electrons remain. As an example, the magnetic momentum of the attached FM part is increased from $+1 \mu_B$ to $+3\mu_B$, resulting in a measured spin-polarized current contributed from both electrons and holes.

In addition to the injection-current mechanism, shift current can be simultaneously excited by circularly polarized light, which will affect the spin polarization. The shift current photoconductivity under circularly polarized light is

$$\begin{aligned} & \sigma_{abc}^{\cup}(0; \omega_{in}, -\omega_{in}) \\ &= \frac{-\pi e^3}{\hbar^2 \omega^2} \sum_{m,n} \int \frac{d^3 k}{(2\pi)^3} f_{mn} (\langle m|v_a|n\rangle \langle n|v_b|m\rangle_{;c} - \langle m|v_b|n\rangle \langle n|v_a|m\rangle_{;c}) \delta(\omega - \omega_{mn}), \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where $\langle n|v_b|m\rangle_{;c} = \frac{\partial \langle n|v_b|m\rangle}{\partial k^c} - i(A_{nn}^c - A_{mm}^c)$ is the “generalized derivatives” of the velocity matrix element and A^c is the intraband Berry connection along the c direction. Unlike linearly polarized light [31], shift current is PT -even, contributing to charge-current. Fortunately, because the magnitude of shift current is usually two orders smaller than that of injection current [24,25,39], the overall observed photocurrent is dominated by injection current and, thus, highly spin-polarized, which is confirmed by the following *ab initio* simulations.

Large photo-driven spin-current in two-dimensional materials.

We employ first-principles simulations (see supplementary information [40]) [41–43] to calculate spin photocurrent of PT -symmetric bilayer AFM CrI_3 . Its bulk structure belongs to the S_6 point group which possesses an out-of-plane C_3 axis and lacks a mirror plane. The top view is illustrated by Figure 2(a), and the blue and red atoms represent the spin-up-layer and spin-down-layer Cr atoms, respectively. Our first-principles calculations indicate that bilayer CrI_3 has an interlayer AFM ground state, in agreement with previous results [17,44,45]. The doubly degenerate bands in momentum space due to PT -symmetry are shown in Figure 2 (b).

Figure 2(c) shows the spin photoconductivity according to Eq. 1. We set the circular polarization of light to be in the xy -plane and measure the S_z spin-current. Because of the depolarization effect and 2D geometry, there are two non-zero components, which are $\eta_x^{\cup, Sz}$ (along x -direction) and $\eta_y^{\cup, Sz}$ (along y -direction), respectively. There is no widely accepted carrier

lifetime τ (Eq. 1) of CrI₃. Previous works [24] adopted ~ 0.4 ps, which is smaller than those of transition metal dichalcogenides, such as MoS₂ (~ 1 ps) [46]. Here we choose a more conservative value of 0.1 ps in Eq. (1), and it is orders-smaller than the spin-relaxation time of typical 2D materials ($\sim$ ns) [47].

The spin photoconductivity is significant, e.g. the $\eta_y^{\uparrow, Sz}$ can reach up to 40 $\mu\text{A}/\text{V}^2$ shown in Figure 2(c). This is roughly one order of magnitude larger than the widely observed charge photoconductivity of BaTiO₃ [48], 2D GeS and its analogs [49] due to BPVE. Moreover, the magnitude of this spin-current is comparable with those of spin-polarized photocurrents in nonmagnetic CdSe and GaAs quantum wells [50–52].

In addition to spin current from the inject current mechanism, circularly polarized light can simultaneously generate a charge-current via the shift-current mechanism (Eq. 2). Figure 2(d) shows the charge-current photoconductivity for circularly xy plane-polarized light. Similar to spin photocurrent, the two non-zero tensors $\sigma_x^{\uparrow}$ and $\sigma_y^{\uparrow}$ are not equivalent due to the C_3 rotation symmetry. Comparing Figures 2 (c) and (d), the charge current is around 1~2 orders of magnitude smaller than the spin-current, resulting in a more than 90% spin polarization.

Finally, we predict that the direction of spin photocurrent can be switched by the Neel vector. Although both configurations in Figures 2 (e) and (f) are AFM, their spin currents are opposite to each other. This is because the magnetic structure indicated in the blue dashed square can be translated to that in the red dashed square by the space-reversal operator (P). Accordingly, the direction of current is switched by P . This correlation between the Neel vector and spin photocurrent is useful for detecting the Neel vector, which has been regarded as a challenge for years [53].

Sizeable photo-driven spin-current without SOC.

SOC is viewed as one of the foundations for spin-current because it can generate spin-polarized currents from charge-current, characterized as the spin Hall effect [54–56]. Besides, SOC lies at the heart of the photo-driven charge current in *PT*-symmetric AFMs, e.g. bilayer CrI₃ [24] and even-septuple layer MnBi₂Te₄ [25], breaking the SU(2) symmetry. Therefore, it is necessary to reveal the origin of such an enhanced spin photocurrent and the role of SOC.

We have calculated the spin photoconductivity η of bilayer AFM CrI₃ by gradually reducing the SOC strength (λ_{so}). We take the *y*-direction spin photocurrent as an example (see *x*-direction in supplementary information [40]), and the results are presented in Figure 3(a): the solid line is the spin photoconductivity with intrinsic SOC strength, and the dashed line is that with negligible SOC ($\lambda = 0.001\lambda_{\text{so}}$). The band structures are provided in the supplementary information [40]. Despite different band structures due to SOC, the magnitudes of two spectra are similar; the spin photoconductivity of the dashed line can reach $45 \mu\text{A}/\text{V}^2$, which is slightly larger than that with full SOC. This surprisingly indicates that SOC is not necessarily responsible for enhanced spin photocurrents.

To further understand this result, we show the spin texture of the valence band $E = -0.17\text{eV}$ (zero energy is at the top of valence bands) with full SOC for bilayer CrI₃ in Figure 3(b). Importantly, the bands are not symmetrical, e.g. the oval-shaped energy contour of the inner band, a consequence of broken SU(2) spin-rotation symmetry by SOC. Therefore, the spin photoconductivity at the *k* point cannot cancel with that at the *-k* point. We illustrate this by plotting the distribution of spin photoconductivity in *k*-space in Figure 3(c). There is a non-odd-parity symmetry of this distribution, which results in a sizable non-zero spin-current.

On the other hand, after reducing SOC ($\lambda = 0.001\lambda_{\text{so}}$), we observe a different picture: the band structure with negligible SOC is symmetrical because of the SU(2) symmetry, as shown in

Figure 3(d). However, the spin texture does not exhibit any symmetry. Therefore, spin-current contributed by k and $-k$ points still cannot cancel each other, resulting in a non-zero value. Figure 3(e) confirms this asymmetric spin photoconductivity distribution for photon energy at 1.2 eV.

Large photo-driven spin-current in 3D materials.

Since the Neel temperature of bilayer CrI_3 is around 40 K [17], we take bulk $\alpha\text{-Fe}_2\text{O}_3$, *i.e.* hematite, as an example to demonstrate the spin photocurrent in room-temperature AFMs, in which long-distance spin transport was reported [57]. Bulk hematite is the most stable form of iron oxides, exhibiting an AFM order with the space group $R\bar{3}c$ and point group D_{3d} . The magnetic moments of adjacent Fe^{3+} layers form a AFM ordering [58]. Below the Morin temperature ($T_M \approx 263$ K), the direction of the magnetic moments is parallel to the z -axis [59] as shown in Figure 4(a). Hematite below T_M preserve the PT symmetry, where the symmetry center is labeled as a dashed circle in Figure 4(a). Therefore, it is an excellent candidate to demonstrate photo-driven spin-current in weak-relativistic systems at room temperature. Although spin-current under linearly polarized light was predicted in hematite by considering the shift-current mechanism [31], a simultaneously excited strong charge-current substantially reduces the spin polarization. In the following, we will show that circularly polarized light can overcome this problem via the proposed spin-CPGE.

We have calculated the photoconductivity $\eta^{\cup, Sz}$ according to Eq. 1 by using a conservative relaxation time, $\tau = 0.1$ ps. The magnetic group of hematite is associated with the reduction to C_3 symmetry, deriving from the representations A_{2g} . For the Sz -component spin photocurrent under circularly polarized light within the xz and yz planes, there are six non-zero tensor elements satisfying $\eta_{zx,x}^{\cup, Sz} = \eta_{yz,y}^{\cup, Sz}$, $\eta_{zx,y}^{\cup, Sz} = \eta_{yz,x}^{\cup, Sz}$, and $\eta_{zx,z}^{\cup, Sz} = \eta_{yz,z}^{\cup, Sz}$. We plot all nonequivalent current tensor elements, e.g. the tensor elements when the polarization of circularly polarized light is set

in yz -plane (Figure 4 (b)) and xy -plane (Figure 4 (c)). Interestingly, the magnitude of spin photoconductivity is in the same order or even higher than that of large SOC materials, e.g. bilayer CrI_3 . For example, the magnitude of photoconductivity ($\eta_{yz,y}^{\cup,Sz}$) can reach up to $200 \mu\text{A}/\text{V}^2$ as shown in Figure 4(b). Such sizeable spin photoconductivity is about one order larger than that of the charge photoconductivity of BaTiO_3 due to BPVE [48], and the same order as that of charge photoconductivity because of CPGE in polar insulators, e.g. GeSe [39] and CdSe [52]. Figure 4 (d) shows the Sz spin photoconductivity of z -direction current under an xy -plane circularly polarized light ($\eta_{xy,z}^{\cup,Sz}$) that is distributed in the ΓTU plane of reciprocal space (see the plane in supplementary information [40]). Similar to the weak SOC result in Figure 3 (e) for CrI_3 , we do not observe any symmetry of spin-conductivity in k -space, leading to a non-zero spin photocurrent.

Outlook.

We demonstrate a spin-CPGE effect for generating highly spin-polarized current in PT -symmetric AFM insulators. Such spin-CPGE is accessible in traditional and emerging AFM insulators. Among them are NiO [60] and Cr_2O_3 [61], which have been used to generate magnon spin-current [5], emerging 2D AFM insulators, such as the MnPS_3 family [8,16], and topological axion insulators, such as the even-layer $\text{Mn}_2\text{Bi}_2\text{Te}_4$ family [62,63]. Our prediction will not only be helpful to understand recent important measurements of vertical-direction photocurrent or spin photo-current in CrI_3 junction devices [64], but also build a general framework to search for efficient spin-pumping via light-matter interactions.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

R.F. thank Zhiqiang Bao for fruitful discussions. R. F. is supported by the Air Force Office of Scientific Research (AFOSR) grant No. FA9550-20-1-0255, and L.Y. is supported by the National

Science Foundation (NSF) grant No. DMR-2124934. The computational resources are provided by the Extreme Science and Engineering Discovery Environment (XSEDE), which is supported by National Science Foundation (NSF) grant number ACI-1548562. The authors acknowledge the Texas Advanced Computing Center (TACC) at The University of Texas at Austin for providing HPC resources.

Note added-Recently, we became aware of theoretical studies by Haowei Xu et al. [65] , which show spin photocurrent of AFM MnBi_2Te_4 .

Email: [†]ruixiangfei@gmail.com
[‡]lyang@physics.wustl.edu

Figures




Figure 1. (a) Doubly degenerate bands due to PT -symmetry. (b) The transport direction of the two opposite directions of spins due to PT -symmetry after pumping. The blue and red ovals represent the contour plot of the two spin components' conduction bands, and the black arrows show the overall spin-current direction. (c) The schematic of circularly polarized light-induced spin-current under circularly polarized light. (d) The circularly polarized light generated electron and hole travel in opposite directions. Here, we define the light generated spin-“down” electron and -“down” hole pair. Solid and open circles represent electrons and holes, respectively. The arrows of the circles represent spin directions. (e) The proposed experimental setup. The spin-“down” hole will annihilate with a spin-“down” electron after being injected into the FM material.




Figure 2. The atomic structure (a) and band structure (b) of bilayer AFM CrI₃. (c) The photo-driven spin-current conductivity along the in-plane x and y -direction for spin S_z . (d) The photo-driven charge current conductivity along the x and y -direction. (e) and (f) The spin-current direction for AFM bilayer CrI₃ (side view of Cr atoms) with opposite Neel vector directions.




Figure 3. (a) The y -direction photo-driven spin-current of the S_z component with full SOC (grey solid line) and extremely weak SOC (dashed line), i.e. SOC strength $\lambda = 0.001\lambda_{so}$. The spin texture of valence bands at $E = -0.17$ eV in Figure 2b with full SOC (b) and extremely weak SOC (d). The spin photo-conductivity distribution in k -space with full SOC (c) and extremely weak SOC (e).




Figure 4. (a) The atomic structure of bulk α -Fe₂O₃, the dashed circle being the PT -symmetry center. The spin S_z component photo-conductivity for the polarization of circularly polarized light in yz plane (b) and in xy plane (c). The spin photo-conductivity distribution in k -space for $(\eta_{xy,z}^{\sigma, S_z})$ (d).

Reference:

- [1] V. Baltz, A. Manchon, M. Tsoi, T. Moriyama, T. Ono, and Y. Tserkovnyak, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **90**, 015005 (2018).
- [2] T. Jungwirth, X. Marti, P. Wadley, and J. Wunderlich, *Nat. Nanotechnol.* **11**, 231 (2016).
- [3] T. Jungwirth, J. Sinova, A. Manchon, X. Marti, J. Wunderlich, and C. Felser, *Nat. Phys.* **14**, 200 (2018).
- [4] R. Cheng, J. Xiao, Q. Niu, and A. Brataas, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **113**, 057601 (2014).
- [5] J. Li, C. B. Wilson, R. Cheng, M. Lohmann, M. Kavand, W. Yuan, M. Aldosary, N. Agladze, P. Wei, M. S. Sherwin, and J. Shi, *Nature* **578**, 70 (2020).
- [6] P. Vaidya, S. A. Morley, J. van Tol, Y. Liu, R. Cheng, A. Brataas, D. Lederman, and E. del Barco, *Science* (80-.). **368**, 160 (2020).
- [7] O. Gomonay, V. Baltz, A. Brataas, and Y. Tserkovnyak, *Nat. Phys.* **14**, 213 (2018).
- [8] R. Cheng, S. Okamoto, and D. Xiao, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **117**, 217202 (2016).
- [9] V. A. Zyuzin and A. A. Kovalev, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **117**, 217203 (2016).
- [10] S. M. Wu, W. Zhang, A. KC, P. Borisov, J. E. Pearson, J. S. Jiang, D. Lederman, A. Hoffmann, and A. Bhattacharya, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **116**, 097204 (2016).
- [11] S. Seki, T. Ideue, M. Kubota, Y. Kozuka, R. Takagi, M. Nakamura, Y. Kaneko, M. Kawasaki, and Y. Tokura, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **115**, 266601 (2015).
- [12] H. T. Simensen, A. Kamra, R. E. Troncoso, and A. Brataas, *Phys. Rev. B* (2020).
- [13] E. Y. Sherman, A. Najmaie, H. M. van Driel, A. L. Smirl, and J. E. Sipe, *Solid State Commun.* **139**, 439 (2006).
- [14] P. Němec, M. Fiebig, T. Kampfrath, and A. V. Kimel, *Nat. Phys.* **14**, 229 (2018).
- [15] Z. Ni, K. Wang, Y. Zhang, O. Pozo, B. Xu, X. Han, K. Manna, J. Paglione, C. Felser, A. G. Grushin, F. de Juan, E. J. Mele, and L. Wu, *Nat. Commun.* **12**, 154 (2021).
- [16] H. Chu, C. J. Roh, J. O. Island, C. Li, S. Lee, J. Chen, J.-G. Park, A. F. Young, J. S. Lee, and D. Hsieh, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **124**, 027601 (2020).
- [17] Z. Sun, Y. Yi, T. Song, G. Clark, B. Huang, Y. Shan, S. Wu, D. Huang, C. Gao, Z. Chen, M. McGuire, T. Cao, D. Xiao, W.-T. Liu, W. Yao, X. Xu, and S. Wu, *Nature* **572**, 497 (2019).
- [18] W. Kraut and R. von Baltz, *Phys. Rev. B* **19**, 1548 (1979).
- [19] J. E. Sipe and A. I. Shkrebtii, *Phys. Rev. B* **61**, 5337 (2000).
- [20] D. E. Parker, T. Morimoto, J. Orenstein, and J. E. Moore, *Phys. Rev. B* **99**, 045121 (2019).
- [21] T. Morimoto and N. Nagaosa, *Sci. Adv.* **2**, e1501524 (2016).

- [22] V. M. Fridkin, A. A. Grekov, P. V. Ionov, A. I. Rodin, E. A. Savchenko, and K. A. Mikhailina, *Ferroelectrics* **8**, 433 (1974).
- [23] A. M. Glass, D. von der Linde, and T. J. Negran, *Appl. Phys. Lett.* **25**, 233 (1974).
- [24] Y. Zhang, T. Holder, H. Ishizuka, F. de Juan, N. Nagaosa, C. Felser, and B. Yan, *Nat. Commun.* **10**, 1 (2019).
- [25] R. Fei, W. Song, and L. Yang, *Phys. Rev. B* **102**, 035440 (2020).
- [26] H. Wang and X. Qian, *Npj Comput. Mater.* **6**, 199 (2020).
- [27] H. Watanabe and Y. Yanase, *Phys. Rev. X* **11**, 011001 (2021).
- [28] S. A. Tarasenko and E. L. Ivchenko, *J. Exp. Theor. Phys. Lett.* **81**, 231 (2005).
- [29] E. L. Ivchenko and S. A. Tarasenko, *Semicond. Sci. Technol.* **23**, 114007 (2008).
- [30] J. Rioux and G. Burkard, *Phys. Rev. B* **90**, 035210 (2014).
- [31] S. M. Young, F. Zheng, and A. M. Rappe, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **110**, 057201 (2013).
- [32] W.-Y. Shan, J. Zhou, and D. Xiao, *Phys. Rev. B* **91**, 035402 (2015).
- [33] S. D. Ganichev, E. L. Ivchenko, V. V. Bel'kov, S. A. Tarasenko, M. Sollinger, D. Weiss, W. Wegscheider, and W. Prettl, *Nature* **417**, 153 (2002).
- [34] S. D. Ganichev, S. A. Tarasenko, V. V. Bel'kov, P. Olbrich, W. Eder, D. R. Yakovlev, V. Kolkovsky, W. Zaleszczyk, G. Karczewski, T. Wojtowicz, and D. Weiss, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **102**, 156602 (2009).
- [35] P. Olbrich, C. Zoth, P. Lutz, C. Drexler, V. V. Bel'kov, Y. V. Terent'ev, S. A. Tarasenko, A. N. Semenov, S. V. Ivanov, D. R. Yakovlev, T. Wojtowicz, U. Wurstbauer, D. Schuh, and S. D. Ganichev, *Phys. Rev. B* **86**, 085310 (2012).
- [36] R.-C. Xiao, D.-F. Shao, Y.-H. Li, and H. Jiang, *ArXiv* 2009.02748 1 (2020).
- [37] R. Fei, X. Lu, and L. Yang, *ArXiv* 2006.10690 (2020).
- [38] J. Shi, P. Zhang, D. Xiao, and Q. Niu, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **96**, 076604 (2006).
- [39] S. R. Panday, S. Barraza-Lopez, T. Rangel, and B. M. Fregoso, *Phys. Rev. B* **100**, 195305 (2019).
- [40] *See Supplemental Material at Xx, Which Includes Refs. Xx. We Show the First-Principles Computational Details*, (n.d.).
- [41] G. Kresse and J. Furthmüller, *Phys. Rev. B* **54**, 11169 (1996).
- [42] G. Kresse and D. Joubert, *Phys. Rev. B* **59**, 1758 (1999).
- [43] J. P. Perdew, K. Burke, and M. Ernzerhof, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **77**, 3865 (1996).
- [44] B. Huang, G. Clark, D. R. Klein, D. MacNeill, E. Navarro-Moratalla, K. L. Seyler, N. Wilson, M. A. McGuire, D. H. Cobden, D. Xiao, W. Yao, P. Jarillo-Herrero, and X. Xu, *Nat. Nanotechnol.* **13**, 544 (2018).

- [45] N. Sivadas, S. Okamoto, X. Xu, C. J. Fennie, and D. Xiao, *Nano Lett.* (2018).
- [46] K. Kaasbjerg, K. S. Thygesen, and K. W. Jacobsen, *Phys. Rev. B* **85**, 115317 (2012).
- [47] L. Yang, N. A. Sinitsyn, W. Chen, J. Yuan, J. Zhang, J. Lou, and S. A. Crooker, *Nat. Phys.* **11**, 830 (2015).
- [48] S. M. Young and A. M. Rappe, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **109**, 116601 (2012).
- [49] X. Mu and J. Zhou, *ArXiv* (2020).
- [50] J. Hübner, W. W. Rühle, M. Klude, D. Hommel, R. D. R. Bhat, J. E. Sipe, and H. M. van Driel, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **90**, 216601 (2003).
- [51] H. Zhao, X. Pan, A. L. Smirl, R. D. R. Bhat, A. Najmaie, J. E. Sipe, and H. M. van Driel, *Phys. Rev. B* **72**, 201302 (2005).
- [52] N. Laman, A. I. Shkrebtii, J. E. Sipe, and H. M. van Driel, *Appl. Phys. Lett.* **75**, 2581 (1999).
- [53] D. F. Shao, S. H. Zhang, G. Gurung, W. Yang, and E. Y. Tsymbal, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* (2020).
- [54] J. E. Hirsch, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **83**, 1834 (1999).
- [55] J. Sinova, D. Culcer, Q. Niu, N. A. Sinitsyn, T. Jungwirth, and A. H. MacDonald, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **92**, 126603 (2004).
- [56] A. Manchon, J. Železný, I. M. Miron, T. Jungwirth, J. Sinova, A. Thiaville, K. Garello, and P. Gambardella, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* (2019).
- [57] R. Lebrun, A. Ross, S. A. Bender, A. Qaiumzadeh, L. Baldrati, J. Cramer, A. Brataas, R. A. Duine, and M. Kläui, *Nature* **561**, 222 (2018).
- [58] L. Pauling and S. B. Hendricks, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **47**, 781 (1925).
- [59] G. Rollmann, A. Rohrbach, P. Entel, and J. Hafner, *Phys. Rev. B* **69**, 165107 (2004).
- [60] T. Kampfrath, A. Sell, G. Klatt, A. Pashkin, S. Mährlein, T. Dekorsy, M. Wolf, M. Fiebig, A. Leitenstorfer, and R. Huber, *Nat. Photonics* **5**, 31 (2011).
- [61] S. P. Pati, M. Al-Mahdawi, S. Ye, Y. Shiokawa, T. Nozaki, and M. Sahashi, *Phys. Rev. B* **94**, 224417 (2016).
- [62] M. M. Otrokov, I. P. Rusinov, M. Blanco-Rey, M. Hoffmann, A. Y. Vyazovskaya, S. V. Eremeev, A. Ernst, P. M. Echenique, A. Arnau, and E. V. Chulkov, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **122**, 107202 (2019).
- [63] C. Liu, Y. Wang, H. Li, Y. Wu, Y. Li, J. Li, K. He, Y. Xu, J. Zhang, and Y. Wang, *Nat. Mater.* **19**, 522 (2020).
- [64] T. Song, E. Anderson, M. W.-Y. Tu, K. Seyler, T. Taniguchi, K. Watanabe, M. A. McGuire, X. Li, T. Cao, D. Xiao, W. Yao, and X. Xu, *ArXiv* 2102.10818 (2021).
- [65] H. Xu, H. Wang, J. Zhou, and J. Li, *Nat. Commun.* **12**, 4330 (2021).

